DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 454 IR 013 206

AUTHOR Schaffer, Dennis R.
TITLE Collective Bargaining: Adversary or Colleague? Chapter 11.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 16p.; In: Instructional Development: The State of the Art. Volume I, 1978; See IR 013 196. For chapter 5, see ED 144 587.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; Questionnaires; Strikes; *Student Attitudes; *Student Participation; Unions

ABSTRACT

This discussion of the effects of unionization of teaching faculty upon the instructional development process in higher education examines both the collective bargaining process and strikes. Mailed questionnaires were used to collect data from instructional developers in instructional development agencies, faculty members, and students. Various scenarios suggested by the replies to the questionnaires are discussed in terms of their possible impact upon instructional development activities, and suggestions are made for steps to be taken to avoid some of the undesirable aspects of these scenarios. Two tables present the tabulated survey data, and a 13-item bibliography is provided. (Author/EW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED292454

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy



# CHAPTER XI

# COLLECTIVE BARGAINING: ADVERSARY OR COLLEAGUE?

By

Dennis R. Schaffer

Based upon their study for the Carnegie Commission, Ladd and Lipset (1976) found that an enormous potential existed for the further growth of faculty unions. By the beginning of 1976, about 95,000 faculty members out of an estimated 600,000 were employed at unionized schools in America and bargaining agents were selected to represent the faculties of 294 institutions with over 410 campuses. Opinion surveys indicated that more and more faculty members were inclined to accept collective bargaining. In fact, 72% indicated they would vote for a union if a collective bargaining election were to be held at their institution. Ladd and Lipset predicted that: "unionization is the wave of academe's future" (p. 11). Recent collective bargaining in higher education has resulted in the emergence of several trends. Two of these trends were identified by Mortimer and Lozier (1972) as: (1) greater codification of faculty-administrative relations, procedures, and policies; and (2) the widening scope of subsequent collective bargaining contracts which, after the initial contract, may expand beyond terms and conditions of employment. As the scope of subsequent contracts broadens, a faculty member's work load is becoming more specifically defined. The analysis of collective bargaining agreements with respect to faculty work loads by Mortimer (1974) found such esoteric considerations as attendance at graduation ceremonies recorded under articles dealing with work load. If the trend toward specific time allocations for instructional efforts continues, will the faculty member flexibility needed during instructional development be lost?

While instructional developers such as Diamond are trying to depart from the "simplistic teacher/student ratio" (1974), more collective bargaining agreements are stating specific teacher/student ratios. During a faculty seminar at the University of Delaware, the merits of the audio-tutorial method were discussed. Benefits, such as accommodating more students with less staff and increasing individual student's contact with senior instructors, were challenged as possibly being in conflict with the collective bargaining agreement. The collective bargaining agreement at the University of Delaware (1975), Article XI, 11.4 states that "the planned student-bargaining unit faculty ratio will not exceed 18.3 full-time graduate and undergraduate students per member of the bargaining

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LeRoy Davenport

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



IR013206

unit in the University as a whole." If an innovative, instructional method can be challenged as being in possible conflict with negotiated articles of agreement, is not instructional development equally vulnerable?

Diamond (1973) finds that the educational programs of most colleges are much as they were thirty years ago. He states that "The three-hour-a-week course, the division of academic subjects, the content of the curriculum, and the roles of teacher and student remained for the most part static" (p. 15). Though Diamond believes that a need for the development of more flexibility and creativity in educational programs exists, the collective bargaining agreements have defined work loads in terms of past practices. Again as an example, Article XI, 11.2 of the University of Delaware's collective bargaining agreement (1975) states that "The composition of a normal work load within a unit will be consistent with past practice within that unit."

A persistent problem in higher education discussed by Ullmer and Stakenas (1971) is the traditional adherence to the lecture method. Conceivably, the only major instructional technique consistent with past practice in a department is the lecture. Since instructional development efforts at most campuses are of relatively recent origin, if they exist at all, at how many universities and colleges is instructional development institutionalized to the extent that it could come under the "consistent with past practices" clause?

Numerous questions have been raised across the country as to the potential impact of collective bargaining upon instructional development. The following two research studies try to answer some of the preceding questions. The studies were conducted by an instructional developer at a state university with a union. Though the developer does not intend to become a scholar in collective bargaining, he does consider it important that he understand the potential problems and benefits of collective bargaining for instructional development.

The first study (Schaffer, 1976) was conducted to determine what has been the actual impact of collective bargaining upon instructional development.

By surveying members of the Division of Instructional Development (DID) of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) concerning their experiences with collective bargaining, an attempt was made to understand the past, present, and future effects of collective bargaining upon instructional development. The central issue raised was whether or not collective bargaining should be considered an adversary or a colleague of instructional development. Instructional development encourages a collegial approach to instruction. Using a systematic approach, an instructional developer brings together the instructor and instructional resources to achieve the maximum educational

impact. The balancing of these resources is many times only achieved by compromise, flexibility, and extra work. Sometimes this balancing is tenuous and subject to collapse from external forces.

To determine if collective bargaining was already asserting an adverse influence, a survey consisting of questions about collective bargaining and instructional development was prepared with the assistance of various officers and members of the DID. A random sample of 197 DID members was drawn. Approximately 29% of the total membership of the DID were surveyed by questionnaire. Two mailings realized an approximate return of 59% (N = 166) from the division members surveyed. Due to no forwarding address, 8% of the questionnaires were returned by the post office. As in the case of Hoban's study (1974), the nonrespondents (33%) were not considered an atypical group but were viewed as not primarily engaged in the field of instructional development. For analysis, the primary roles of the DID members were consolidated into three categories with the respective response rates of Instructional Developer (33%), Administrator (40%), and Teacher (27%).

Age, sex, union membership, type of institution, and manner of union representation at the institution were thought to be important for describing the Division for Instructional Development's membership. The statistically average respondent was (Table 1): male (78%), between 31 and 50 (62%), with neither present nor past union membership (67%), at a public (83%) institution of higher education (71%), with some manner of union representation (46%). A comparison with Hoban's study (1974) of instructional developers indicated a trend toward younger developers. Hoban found the majority (54%) of the DID members to be 41 years old or older, while Schaffer found 53% between 20 and 40. More females have also joined the DID (from 9% in 1973 to 22% in 1975). Both studies found college campuses dominating the locale of the members (Hoban, 77% and Schaffer, 71%). Aside from minor differences, Schaffer assumed that Hoban's description of instructional developers was applicable to his study.

Schaffer found that DID members (46%) were located at institutions with union representation. Considering that 16% of higher education institutions have union representation, it seemed that collective bargaining was very close to home for most DID members. Unions were perceived by a majority of the DID members to be moderately (60%) to very (21%) valuable in our society. Though members believed faculty should be allowed to unionize (85%) and strike (61%), only 38% indicated they would actually support a strike by faculty. These findings were similar to the Ladd and Lipset study of faculty which found a surprising amount of support for collective bargaining. The low rate of support for a strike probably reflects the reality that it is easier to abstractly support collective bargaining than to actually man the picket lines.

TABLE 1

RESPONSES IN PERCENTAGES* TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING BY INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPERS (ID), ADMINISTRATORS (ADM), TEACHERS (TEACH), AND ID, ADM, AND TEACH COMBINED (ALL)

| Item | | Group | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ALL | ID | ADM | TEACH |
| 1. | Age: | | | | |
| | 20–30 | 17 | 21 | 20 | 9 |
| | 31–40 | 36 | 45 | 30 | 34 |
| | 41–50 | 26 | 11 | 30 | 38 |
| | 51–60 | 14 | 11 | 17 | 13 |
| | Over 60 | 7 | 13 | 2 | 6 |
| 2. | Sex: | | | | |
| | Male | 78 | 79 | 78 | 78 |
| | Female | 22 | 21 | 22 | 22 |
| 3. | Type of institution: | | | | |
| | Public | 83 | 79 | 80 | 91 |
| | Independent/denominational/ non-degree granting | 17 | 21 | 19 | 0 |
| 4. | Highest degree offered: | | | | |
| | Certificate/diploma/none | 11 | 19 | 9 | 0 |
| | AA | 8 | 0 | 20 | 6 |
| | BA/BS; MA/MS; and Ph.D./Ed.D. | 63 | 79 | 70 | 87 |
| 5. | Present or past active membership in any union: | | | | |
| | Yes | 32 | 29 | 33 | 34 |
| | No | 67 | 68 | 67 | 66 |
| 6. | Collective bargaining agency representing the faculty: | | | | |
| | None | 44 | 39 | 48 | 44 |
| | AAUP, NEA, AFT, AFL–CIO, Local | 46 | 45 | 46 | 50 |
| | Don't know | 8 | 11 | 7 | 6 |

Cont'd

TABLE 1 (Cont'd)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7. Overall evaluation of the value of unions in our society: | | | | |
| Little value | 10 | 8 | 11 | 13 |
| Moderate value | 60 | 63 | 61 | 56 |
| Very valuable | 21 | 26 | 22 | 13 |
| Don't know | 6 | 3 | 4 | 13 |
| 8. If faculty should be allowed to unionize: | | | | |
| Yes | 85 | 89 | 85 | 81 |
| No | 10 | 11 | 7 | 16 |
| Don't know | 3 | 0 | 4 | 3 |
| 9. If faculty should be allowed to strike: | | | | |
| Yes | 61 | 63 | 57 | 66 |
| No | 27 | 24 | 30 | 25 |
| Don't know | 11 | 13 | 11 | 9 |
| No response | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 10. Support a strike by faculty: | | | | |
| Yes | 38 | 47 | 35 | 31 |
| No | 35 | 24 | 39 | 44 |
| Don't know | 22 | 29 | 15 | 25 |
| 11. Effect collective bargaining will have upon the quality of instruction: | | | | |
| Improve quality | 9 | 8 | 7 | 16 |
| Remain the same | 13 | 32 | 33 | 28 |
| Erode quality in education | 25 | 21 | 30 | 22 |
| Don't know | 30 | 37 | 22 | 34 |
| 12. The extent that as subsequent collective bargaining contracts are negotiated, a widening scope of issues emerge and negotiations are not limited to salary and work load concerns: | | | | |
| Extensive occurrences | 9 | 11 | 7 | 9 |
| Some occurrences | 22 | 26 | 22 | 16 |
| No trend noted | 59 | 53 | 59 | 66 |
| 13. The extent of increase in specific rules regarding faculty and administrative relations, procedures, and policies in collective bargaining agreements: | | | | |
| Extensive occurrences | 12 | 13 | 13 | 9 |
| Some occurrences | 28 | 39 | 22 | 25 |
| No trend noted | 47 | 39 | 46 | 56 |

Cont'd

TABLE 1 (Cont'd)

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | Effect of the widening scope of subsequent contracts upon instructional development: | | | | |
| | Positive effect | 23 | 21 | 22 | 28 |
| | No effect | 11 | 11 | 17 | 3 |
| | Negative effect | 41 | 37 | 43 | 41 |
| | Don't know | 22 | 32 | 15 | 22 |
| 15. | Effect of an increase of specific rules and policies upon instructional development: | | | | |
| | Positive effect | 17 | 21 | 11 | 22 |
| | No effect | 9 | 8 | 15 | 3 |
| | Negative effect | 38 | 37 | 37 | 41 |
| | Don't know | 26 | 29 | 24 | 25 |
| 16. | Attempts through collective bargaining to negotiate provisions for release time, money, staff, and facilities for instructional development: | | | | |
| | No attempts | 54 | 61 | 52 | 50 |
| | Some attempts | 28 | 29 | 28 | 28 |
| | Extensive attempts | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 17. | Belief that instructional development will be adversely affected by collective bargaining: | | | | |
| | Yes | 34 | 26 | 33 | 44 |
| | No | 30 | 39 | 28 | 22 |
| | Don't know | 29 | 34 | 30 | 22 |

*Percentages do not total 100%, since 'no response' category has not been included for table brevity.

When asked what effect collective bargaining would have upon the quality of instruction, only 9% thought instruction would be improved, while 25% believed that collective bargaining would erode quality, and 30% did not know the outcome. Many of the Instructional Developers' written comments to this question expressed hope mixed with skepticism that collective bargaining would improve many working conditions for their faculty and the quality of instruction. One person thought that union concerns seemed to be centered more on the instructor than on the student, and therefore, instruction would suffer. Another developer felt that though collective bargaining should improve instruction

at his college, he would oppose it with vigor if he ever felt there was any eroding of quality. The most extreme reaction came from a developer who believed that a strike is the lowest form of protest and should not be engaged in by professionals.

Administrators also tended to be skeptical about collective bargaining improving the quality of instruction. One man thought that teachers would only do the required minimum under collective bargaining conditions and would not voluntarily involve themselves in instructional development efforts. If instructional development efforts were required under the contract, the instructional developer could then be in the middle of a fight between administration and faculty. Some teachers also noted serious dangers to the quality of education if contracts caused power struggles between administrators and faculty. Though many comments reflected a concern that collective bargaining would erode the quality of education, most respondents were not really sure that this would occur.

Responding to trends noted in the research literature on collective bargaining, 59% found no trend towards subsequent collective bargaining contracts widening the scope of issues negotiated from salary and work load concerns. Also, 47% noted no trend towards an increase of specific rules regarding faculty and administrative relations, procedures, and policies in collective bargaining agreements. Though the respondents noted no local trend towards more specific rules, they viewed any such possible trend as having a potentially negative effect upon instructional development efforts.

A recurring theme in many comments was apprehension that as more rules and red tape emerged, creativity, innovation, and subsequently instructional development will suffer. Other themes included: collective bargaining contracts tended to fit everyone into a specific, potentially stifling role; the rule-making process would polarize faculty and administration and lead to a breakdown of information, communication and cooperation; and an apprehension as to the future relations between administrators and faculty, with instructional development becoming a "privilege" or a "concession" within a power struggle.

Two other interesting results were found in the Schaffer study. First, there were attempts being made to negotiate provisions for release time, money, staff, and facilities for instructional development. This finding was consistent with a national trend towards the emergence of a widening scope of issues after the first contract. Second, 29% did not know whether instructional development would be adversely affected by collective bargaining. Apparently, many DID members were not sure as to the potential impact upon instructional development of the various issues surrounding collective bargaining. Instructional developers were shown by the study to be more optimistic than teachers.

The research literature indicates that there will be major changes within any institution which selects a bargaining agent, but the Schaffer study found it difficult to fully estimate the implications of collective bargaining upon instructional development. Although an overall analysis of the results of the study did not indicate any past or present major problems for instructional development, it was evident that the potential existed. According to 72% of the respondents to the Schaffer study, implications of these changes on instructional development must be the concern of everyone engaged in the improvement of instruction.

Unions, strikes, and students represent a contemporary combination of variables emerging in American higher education. What actual impact students will have upon collective bargaining and, subsequently, upon instructional development is a speculative matter. Bond (1974) examined some student concerns regarding faculty unionism. She believed that students are concerned with the effect collective bargaining will have on the quality of university instruction and student participation in university governance. One concern expressed was over the absence of students at the bargaining table and thereby the forfeiting of their role in university decision-making.

Various recommendations were made as to how student involvement in collective bargaining might best be accomplished. Some of the strategies suggested included extending observer status to students at negotiations, seeking judicial intervention to prevent faculty strikes, and lobbying for legislation. Bond believed that students should not be content with only observer status but should seek a more active role in the bargaining process.

The proposed active role included lobbying for legislation to allow students to participate in bargaining sessions, representation by counsel, the right to caucus and the right to identify issues over which students could, as provided by statue, exercise a veto power. Materialization of Shark's (1973) prediction, that the day is approaching when students will be manning their own picket lines, will be the result of the willingness of students to assume a more active role. Bucklew (1973) indicated that the "chronology of student activism of the last half century indicated a pattern of increased willingness on the part of students to adopt an independent, adversarial posture toward the university" (p. 1).

The purpose of a second Schaffer (1975) study was to determine the degree of willingness and the ability of students to adopt a more "independent, adversarial posture" as related to collective bargaining in higher education. This study provided a basic analysis of the impact of collective bargaining in higher education attributable to students. If Bond's concerns were shared by significant numbers of undergraduates, tripartite bargaining among faculty, administration, and students could

become a future reality in higher education and, thus, another concern for instructional developers.

A Student Opinion Survey (SOS) was administered to a group of randomly selected undergraduate students at the University of Delaware during November, 1974. Student interviewers personally contacted each student to administer the questionnaire. They were successful in having 75% of the selected group (363 students), complete the questionnaire. The SOS contained 14 items concerning student perceptions of collective bargaining and its impact on student life. An introductory statement defining collective bargaining was read to each student prior to his responding to SOS items (See Note on Table 2). Demographic questions were asked concerning academic major, academic year, sex, and grade point index. Percentage tabulations, multivariate analysis of variance, and discriminant analysis were performed on the data to isolate variables.

Of the 363 undergraduate respondents, only 14% had been or were currently members of a union while 28% indicated that at least one of their parents had been a union member. Unions were considered to be of great or average value to our society by 95% of the students. Though 54% of the sample thought that faculty should be allowed to unionize, only 17% could identify the present faculty collective bargaining agency at the University of Delaware. When asked if the role of students in university governance would be increased as a result of collective bargaining, responses indicated 48% did not know, 23% felt it would be increased, 21% felt it would remain the same, and 8% saw a reduced role. In regard to the quality of university instruction, 38% did not know what effect collective bargaining would have on instruction with 25% believing instruction would be eroded and 24% predicting improvement. A response by 83% of the sample showed strong belief that an effect of increases in salaries and fringe benefits for faculty would be higher tuition for students. Though 70% of the undergraduates believed that public employees should be allowed to strike and 61% felt that faculty should be allowed to strike, only 21% indicated that at present they would support a strike by university faculty.

Multivariate analysis of variance and discriminant analysis were performed to determine the following relationships among the following variables within the SOS: (a) grade point average, (b) class standing of students, (c) academic major, (d) sex of the student, (d) if the student was or had been a member of any union, (f) if the student believed that faculty should be allowed to strike, and (g) if the student would support a strike by university faculty. Overall, F ratios were found non-significant for respondents' grade point average, class standing, or academic major. Interpretable results were found for the other relationships.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE TABULATIONS OF QUESTIONS FROM THE STUDENT OPINION SURVEY (SOS)

| SOS Items | All Respondents | Male | Female |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Are you now or have you been a member of any union? | | | |
| 1) Yes | 14 | 24 | 5 |
| 2) No | 86 | 76 | 95 |
| 2. Are either of your parents now or have they been a member of any union? | | | |
| 1) Yes | 28 | 27 | 30 |
| 2) No | 62 | 64 | 62 |
| 3) Don't know | 10 | 9 | 8 |
| 3. What is your overall evaluation of the value of unions in our society? | | | |
| 1) No value at all | 5 | 7 | 3 |
| 2) Average value | 57 | 48 | 64 |
| 3) Very valuable | 38 | 45 | 33 |
| 4. Do you believe that public employee collective bargaining is bad public policy? | | | |
| 1) Yes | 6 | 8 | 5 |
| 2) No | 68 | 71 | 65 |
| 3) Don't know | 26 | 21 | 30 |
| 5. Are civil rights issues involved in allowing public employee collective bargaining? | | | |
| 1) Yes | 43 | 46 | 40 |
| 2) No | 10 | 11 | 8 |
| 3) Don't know | 47 | 43 | 52 |
| 6. Do you believe that university faculty should be allowed to unionize? | | | |
| 1) Yes | 54 | 60 | 50 |
| 2) No | 20 | 22 | 50 |
| 3) Don't know | 26 | 18 | 31 |

Cont'd

TABLE 2 (Cont'd)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **7. What collective bargaining agency (union) now represents the faculty at the University of Delaware?** | | | |
| 1) Don't know | 76 | 75 | 78 |
| 2) AAUP | 17 | 20 | 14 |
| 3) NEA | 5 | 3 | 6 |
| 4) AFT | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 5) AFL–CIO | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6) Other | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **8. What impact will collective bargaining have upon the participation of students in university governance?** | | | |
| 1) Increase | 23 | 25 | 22 |
| 2) Remain the same | 21 | 28 | 15 |
| 3) Reduce | 8 | 6 | 7 |
| 4) Don't know | 48 | 41 | 56 |
| **9. What impact will collective bargaining have upon the quality of university instruction?** | | | |
| 1) Improve quality | 24 | 25 | 23 |
| 2) Remain the same | 25 | 30 | 20 |
| 3) Erode quality | 13 | 15 | 11 |
| 4) Don't know | 38 | 30 | 46 |
| **10. Do you believe that students must involve themselves in the collective bargaining process or forfeit their role in university decision making?** | | | |
| 1) Yes | 40 | 38 | 42 |
| 2) No | 30 | 41 | 21 |
| 3) Don't know | 30 | 22 | 37 |
| **11. What effect will increases in salaries and fringe benefits won by faculty unions have upon tuition rates?** | | | |
| 1) Increase | 83 | 89 | 79 |
| 2) Remain the same | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 3) Reduce | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| 4) Don't know | 14 | 9 | 16 |
| **12. Do you believe that public employees should be allowed to strike?** | | | |
| 1) Yes | 70 | 67 | 72 |
| 2) No | 22 | 24 | 20 |
| 3) Don't know | 8 | 9 | 8 |

TABLE 2 (Cont'd)

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 13. Do you believe that university faculty should be allowed to strike? | | | |
| 1) Yes | 61 | 61 | 61 |
| 2) No | 27 | 26 | 28 |
| 3) Don't know | 12 | 13 | 11 |
| 14. Would you support a strike by university faculty? | | | |
| 1) Yes | 21 | 22 | 20 |
| 2) No | 36 | 35 | 37 |
| 3) Don't know | 43 | 43 | 43 |

NOTE: Of 484 students sampled, 363 completed questionnaire (75%) and heard the following statement read prior to responding to the SOS items: "The following questions are concerned with the role of unions and the process of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining is the negotiation between an employer and union representative usually on wages, hours, and working conditions, which results in a legally binding contract."

Regarding the respondent's sex, the analysis isolated SOS items 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 11. For items 4, 6, 8, and 9, females had a higher "do not know" response rate than males. On item 1, only 5% of the females were or had been a member of a union (24% for males). The interpretation attributed to this finding was that females differ from males due to their lack of association with unions and issues related to collective bargaining in higher education. When analyzing the effect of union membership, items 8, 9, 10, and 11, which directly dealt with the impact of collective bargaining on student life, had significant univariate F ratios but they failed to form a pattern. The percentage tabulations of items 8, 9, and 10 indicated large responses to the "don't know" option for each item (48%, 38%, and 30%, respectively). The students seemed certain that increases in salaries and fringe benefits won by unions would increase tuition, but had no consensus regarding what other impact collective bargaining would have on their lives. Other results indicated strong beliefs by students that university faculty should be allowed to unionize and to strike. Support was shown also for the right of public employees to strike. Various items (3, 4, and 5), with significant univariate F ratios, also indicated that students perceived unions to be of value in our society and that collective bargaining for public employees was not perceived as bad public policy. Though SOS items 3, 6, 9, 12, and 13 indicated strong student support for unions and collective bargaining in general, only 21% would support a strike by faculty with 43% undecided on this issue. Students apparently were

not ready to support an actual faculty strike, since it would have direct impact on their lives.

The results of this study did not indicate a situation favorable to the assumption by students of a more active role in collective bargaining in higher education. Demographic analysis found only a small percentage of the students having had any direct experience with unions as members. The only demographic characteristic to have an overall significant F ratio for discrimination was the student's sex. The significance apparently was based upon the lack of association of females with unions in our society.

Assertions that students are concerned with the effect of collective bargaining on the quality of instruction and student participation in university governance were not substantiated. Questionnaire items designed to demonstrate the degree of student concerns failed to form significant patterns. Though students seemed certain that increases in salaries and fringe benefits won by unions would increase tuition, they failed to discern whether or not collective bargaining would have any additional impact on their lives. The presence of the large percentage of "don't know" responses to the various impact questions seemed to reflect a genuine lack of understanding as to what the actual impact might be.

Overall, students seemed supportive of unions and recognized their value in our society. They believed that public employee collective bargaining was not bad public policy and extended this belief to include higher education. The findings indicated strong support for the right of university faculty to unionize and strike. Though students indicated general support for unions and collective bargaining, only 21% reported willingness to support an actual faculty strike. Again, it seems that as issues become specific to student lives, they were not able to be as decisive. At the present time, the willingness or the ability of students to adopt a more "independent, adversarial posture" in collective bargaining is questionable. Whether this will change in the future will probably depend upon whether collective bargaining continues to be experienced vicariously by students or whether it begins to have a direct impact upon their lives.

Returning to the central issue that collective bargaining raises for instructional development: Will collective bargaining enter into a more adversarial or collegial role with instructional development? Since the ramifications of collective bargaining in education are as numerous as the permutations of the different types of institutions, faculty, and social conditions that exist, generalizations are difficult to make. Obvious results of collective bargaining activities will be major changes in faculty-administrative relations, terms and conditions of employment, and governance. As Mortimer and Lozier noted, while the scope of

initial collective bargaining agreements may be limited, the scope of what is negotiable in the future is not limited.

Implications of these changes for instructional development efforts must be the concern of everyone engaged in the improvement of instruction. Mortimer and Lozier (1972) advise institutions involved in collective bargaining "to plan carefully what can be achieved through the process to enhance the institution's effectiveness" (p. 33). They imply that higher education could be a victim of collective bargaining rather than the recipient of its benefits. They also warn that basic freedoms should not be treated lightly or sacrificed to the general desire to reach an agreement. It is possible that such agreements will enhance educational impact if they are put together wisely and with some understanding of their implications. A possibility exists that if innovative instructional methods can be in conflict with negotiated articles of agreement, so can instructional development efforts.

Of course, the selection of a collective bargaining agent at a college is not in itself a harbinger of doom for instructional development. The collective bargaining process can also offer an opportunity for greater implementation of instructional development. Provisions for released time, money, staff, and facilities for instructional development could be negotiated as easily as the more esoteric items.

At this time it is difficult to estimate the full implications of collective bargaining upon instructional development. It is evident that there will be major changes within any institution which selects a bargaining agent. If these changes are to enhance educational impact, it will be the result of the efforts of bargaining teams to understand the full implications of the various articles of agreement. Instructional developers will need to provide information to and consult with bargaining team members on the implications for instructional development.

An instructional developer cannot operate independently of or in control of these influences. The individual instructional developer in each institution is going to have to come to terms with collective bargaining. For if he fails to appreciate the implications of collective bargaining for instructional development, he may find himself negotiated out of the educational improvement process. He must realize that collective bargaining can serve as either a colleague or an adversary to the unwary instructional developer.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Bond, L. Impact of collective bargaining on students. *Lifelong Learners – A New Clientele for Higher Education,* 1974, pp. 131–135.

Bucklew, N. A. *Students and Unions* (Report No. 22). University Park, Pennsylvania: Center for the Study of Higher Education, 1973.

*Collective Bargaining Agreement – University of Delaware and American Association of University Professors, University of Delaware Chapter.* Newark, Delaware: September 5, 1975.

Diamond, R. M., telephone interview, 1974. Cited by James E. Holsclaw, The development of procedural guidelines for the systematic design of instruction within higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1974.

Diamond, R. M., Eickmann, P. E., Kelly, E. F., Holloway, R. E., Vickery, T. R., and Pascarella, E. R. *Instructional Development in Higher Education.* Syracuse, New York: Center for Instructional Development, 1973.

Hoban, D. The instructional developer. *AV Communication Review, 1974, 22,* pp. 453–466.

Ladd, E. C., and Lipset, S. M. The growth of faculty unions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 26, 1976, 11.

Mortimer, K. P., and Lozier, G. *Collective Bargaining: Implications for Governance.* Report No. 17, June, 1972, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Mortimer, K. P., and Lozier, G. *Faculty Work Load and Collective Bargaining.* July, 1974, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

Schaffer, D. R., and Kirsch, I. *Students, Strikes, and Unions* (Research Report RR-75–2). Newark, Delaware: Instructional Resources Center, 1975.

Schaffer, D. R. *Collective bargaining and/or instructional development: A question of interdependence or independence.* Paper presented at the Association for Educational Communications and Technology National Convention, Anaheim, California, March, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 122837.)

Shark, A. The students' right to collective bargaining. *Change,* April, 1973.

Ullmer, E. J., with Stakenas, R. G. *Instructional Development Handbook.* Tallahassee, Florida: Division of Instructional Research and Service, Florida State University, 1971.